

WTB DOCKET  
NO. 02-196

From: Terry Fishel  
To: "suethomas@knscomm.com".GWIA1.ROUTE\_A  
Date: 1/31/02 9:18AM  
Subject: Re: I2Way - Responding to I2Way's attachments

Thanks again for your comments. I will forward them on for consideration of i2way's filings.

>>> "Sue Thomas" <suethomas@knscomm.com> 01/31/02 08:36AM >>>  
Mr. Fishel.

I have reviewed the comments made in the attachments. I would like to make just a few more comments to add to my original. Do you mind forwarding them as well? Thank you very much.

The fact that the system is "invisible" sounds great – but I seriously still question the impact it will have. I clearly remember the cellular folks saying that you would never get a busy signal, and the 800 MHz trunking folks talking about almost "limitless" capacity.

What we have seen in the Denver market has been busy signals from both types of signals because of the rapid growth and the fact that the spectrum is a limited resource. I would suspect it will work well initially - and then will become busier and busier until the point where our critical telemetry systems find it impossible to function. At this point their subsystem will be in place with many users and it will be difficult if not impossible to solve the problem without affecting these newer users.

The coordination process has been designed to protect existing users – this certainly bypasses that process and gives this company almost limitless potential for unchecked growth in any market - with no protection for existing users - and certainly a major problem for future telemetry users. Where are we going to put them? I do not believe that the spectrum can ever be "invisible" - if it is being used, it is unavailable for other users. Use in Denver is a problem now – this cannot be at all beneficial! What happens to the SCADA and telemetry system that is not busy for a few minutes - then I2way takes those frequencies for a customer because it was not busy. Most low power users have limited and short conversations or short limited data bursts. If I2way is proposing voice users, the conversations could be quite long- and the SCADA then has a critical alarm and the frequency is being used. The existing users clearly cannot access his system nor can they transmit this critical alarm. We understand now the frequencies are shared – but the coordination provides some degree of protection between users. We now have a system that proposes a busy channel lock-out that has major limitations unless they agree to limit the conversations.

If I2Way argues that they will take the new users, this is a problem as well. For critical systems affecting public health (water and wastewater in particular) it is not wise to have a large 3rd party in charge of maintenance. Most of these clients prefer to keep responsibility and maintenance within their control. These frequencies are used for by Jefferson County Public Schools and Denver Public Schools for in-school security. (During Columbine both the cell phones and the 800 MHz trunked systems failed to provide needed communications because of the limited

capacity) There are unique and critical timing issues, automation issues, and many other issues that cannot possibly be addressed by a company the size of I2Way for each of their customers.

Nextel is a prime example of the reluctance to "solve" a problem quickly. Nextel has caused major interference to our public safety 800 MHz systems both here and nationwide. The proposed solution has been to give Nextel the spectrum they now occupy and to move the public safety systems through a frequency-swapping plan. This almost rewards Nextel for causing interference - but more importantly it clearly illustrates a problem that is a number of years along that is still causing problems to police and fire systems.

PLEASE consider the ramifications of this new system! If I2Way wants 130 frequency pairs - let them buy them in one of the pending auctions. These auctions were designed for this. PLEASE don't take away this spectrum or endanger this spectrum for existing and future legitimate users.

Thank you very much for considering these comments. I know it must be a difficult decision for you. I2Way has obviously hired large legal firms and invested many dollars to forward this network. Please do not change the regulations for this one firm!

L. Sue Scott-Thomas  
KNS Communications Consultants  
10265 West Evans Avenue  
Denver CO 80227-2089  
(800) 847-5670 - Cell: (303) 349-9215

----- Original Message -----

From: "Terry Fishel" <TFISHEL@fcc.gov>  
To: <suethomas@knscomm.com>  
Cc: "Jon Sprague" <JSPRAGUE@fcc.gov>  
Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2002 11:16 AM  
Subject: Re: I2Way

Dear Ms. Thomas,

Thanks for voicing your concerns. The Commercial Wireless Division (CWD) of the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau is currently reviewing I2Way's many application filings for frequency justification. As you will see from the attachments on their filings, they argue that the equipment they use will effectively make their system "invisible" from a coordination perspective. Additionally, they have requested a declaratory ruling on how Section 90.187(e) is to be interpreted for purposes of limiting frequencies requested for the operation of trunked systems. Note that Section 90.35(e) provides a limitation with regard to the number of frequencies that are assignable for a conventional (non trunked) type of system. I will forward your concerns to those individuals in CWD that will be involved in the aforementioned review. Likewise, I will forward your comments to the

Private Wireless Division for their consideration.

Thanks!  
Fishel

>>> "Sue Thomas" <suethomas@knscomm.com> 01/30/02 11:57AM >>>  
Mr. Fishel:

I am extremely concerned. I have just discovered that a company named I2Way has received coordination for multiple frequencies in what was previously the 2 watt offset pool. Many of the Water, Wastewater, and telemetry applications are in this pool.

I first noticed it when I was researching for a client in Albuquerque -- there they had filed over 120 frequencies within a 121 mile radius of Albuquerque.

I just ran across the same thing in Denver - File number 0000372385 - there are in excess of 130 frequencies filed within a 121 mile radius of the federal building in downtown Denver.

Not only does this prevent legitimate users from using the frequency - it seems to be a totally inappropriate use of these frequencies which are designed for shared use among many users. I would anticipate considerable harmful interference if a large network is built by these people. In addition, it makes it impossible to coordinate any other users within certain distances of the center location listed by this user.

Please tell me what we can be done to file a formal complaint. There are auctioned frequencies available for people that want to build large networks - but to allow this type of use seems totally inappropriate. I contacted PCIA and they said they were doing this all over the country and did not know what the application was. I pulled a list of many applications which are pending in level 2 at the FCC.

I work with many engineering firms and design water/wastewater telemetry systems. We have typically recommended the 2 watt frequencies to reduce interference to other users and to make good use of the spectrum. This is very alarming. Although these are shared frequencies - this does not seem to be an appropriate use. I would seriously question whether they can meet construction requirements.

Your response would be greatly appreciated.

Jon Sprague in the local office told me I should contact you regarding my concerns

L. Sue Scott-Thomas, President  
KNS Communications Consultants  
10265 West Evans Avenue  
Denver CO 80227-2089  
(800) 847-5670 - Cell: (303) 349-9215